



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,968	11/02/2001	Hans-Ulrich Demuth	20488-26DIV	3916

21710 7590 01/27/2003

BROWN, RUDNICK, BERLACK & ISRAELS, LLP.  
BOX IP, 18TH FLOOR  
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER  
BOSTON, MA 02111

EXAMINER

MELLER, MICHAEL V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1654

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/682,968

Applicant(s)

DEMUTH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael V. Meller

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2002 and 07 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Newly presented claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The phrase, "a compound having a means for modulating enzymatic activity of DPIV and DPIV analogous enzymes" is not supported by the instant specification. Applicants do not have support for this limitation in the claims anywhere in the specification. Thus, the claims must be cancelled and/or clarification of this statement must be made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of administering to a mammal a therapeutically effective amount of an inhibitor of DPIV and physiologically acceptable adjuvants and/or excipients for reducing in said mammal activity of endogenous DPIV,

Art Unit: 1654

does not reasonably provide enablement for administering any and all effectors for reducing enzymatic activity of DPIV and DPIV-analogous enzyme. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Applicants arguments have been considered but are not deemed to be persuasive.

It is clear from the specification that the compounds inhibit DPIV activity. The specification is enabled for a method of administering to a mammal a therapeutically effective amount of an inhibitor of DPIV and physiologically acceptable adjuvants and/or excipients for reducing in said mammal activity of endogenous DPIV. Since the compounds inhibit the activity, then that is what the specification is enabled for.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of the phrase, "an effector for reducing enzymatic activity of DPIV" continues to be confusing. The compounds inhibit the activity of the enzyme. That is what they do. The substrates, pseudosubstrates, binding proteins or antibodies all inhibit the enzymatic activity of DPIV. To use the term "effector" is very vague. What does that mean ? If one effects something it could be positive or negative. Applicant's method very clearly is interested in inhibiting the enzymatic activity of DPIV. How can applicant claim that DPIV activity is not inhibited by the compounds but only "effected "

Art Unit: 1654

? Effected is very relative and subjective of a term. Reciting "inhibited" is very definite and its meaning is well understood while "effected" is very confusing, subjective and relative. A biological process can be effected by something but that could be in any number of ways. Whereas, if a biological process is inhibited it is very clear to one of ordinary skill in the art what happened.

New claims 7-11 are confusing since the phrase, "a compound having a means for modulating enzymatic activity of DPIV and DPIV analogous enzymes". What is meant by this term ? This term is not defined in the specification and is very relative and subjective. How does one "modulate" activity. This term has similar problems to "effector" as described above.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-11 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-4 of U. S. Patent No. 6,319,893 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: the claims in the parent patent (6,319,893) claim and inhibitor of the enzyme to be used in the claimed method. Applicant has claimed "an effector" or "a compound having a means for modulating enzymatic activity of DPIV and DPIV analogous enzymes" which is a broader interpretation of inhibiting as claimed in the parent application which is now patent no. 6, 319,893. Since "inhibiting" would read on these two terms the claims are rejected under this section.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 97/40832.

The claim reads on a patient administered the claimed compound to inhibit the enzyme activity of DPIV. The applicant has not qualified the patient as having hypoglycemia.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Meller whose telephone number is 703-308-4230. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 703-306-3220. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1654

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0294 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M V Meller', followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Michael V. Meller  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1654

MVM  
January 23, 2003